REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 15 and 17-19 have been amended. Thus, claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent.

Noted - Priority Document Received By USPTO

The indication (see previously Office Action Summary dated October 29, 2007, boxes 12(a) as checked) that the certified copy of the priority document has been received by the USPTO is noted with appreciation.

Noted - IDS Considered

The indication (see attachment to previously Office Action dated October 29, 2007) that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) as filed on February 19, 2004 and references listed therein have been considered is noted with appreciation.

Noted - Drawings Approved

The indication (see previously Office Action Summary dated March 31, 2008, boxes (10)(a) as checked)) that the Drawings (submitted on February 29, 2008) have been approved is noted with appreciation.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Pat. No. 6,961,783 issued to Cook et al. (hereinafter referred to as Cook).

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

As an example, independent claim 1 (amended) recites (among other things) the following features:

> a first database used for searching for a private IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination;
>
> a second database used for searching for a global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination;
>
> a judging unit to judge a combination of network types to which the communication source and the communication destination respectively belong, based on a result results of identification by the identifying unit; and
>
> a searching unit to search for the private IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the first database if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the private IP address network, to search for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the global IP address network, to refuse the query if the communication source belongs to the global IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the private IP address network, and to search for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if the communication source belongs to the private IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the global IP address network.

As will be explained below, at least these features of claim 1 provide distinctions over Cook. The cited portions of Cook do not disclose that the first and second databases and a searching unit that searches for the private IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the first database if both of the

communication source and the communication destination belong to the private IP address network, searches for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the global IP address network, refuses the query if the communication source belongs to the global IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the private IP address network, and searches for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if the communication source belongs to the private IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the global IP address network.

Hence, claim 1 distinguishes over Cook at least because of the above-noted features. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In view of the distinction of claim 1 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in Cook. Hence, Cook does not anticipate claim 1.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 8 and 15

As an example, independent claims 8 and 15 (amended) recites (among other things) the following features:

> searching for the private IP address network corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using a first database, which is used for searching for a private IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination, if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the private IP address network;

> searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using a second database, which is used for searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the

15

communication destination, if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the global IP address network,

refusing the query if the communication source belongs to the global IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the private IP address network; and

searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if the communication source belongs to the private IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the global IP address network.

As will be explained below, at least these features of claims 8 and 15 provide distinctions over Cook. The cited portions of Cook do not disclose that searching for the private IP address network corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using a first database, which is used for searching for a private IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination, if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the private IP address network, searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using a second database, which is used for searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination, if both of the communication source and the communication destination belong to the global IP address network, refusing the query if the communication source belongs to the global IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the private IP address network; and searching for the global IP address corresponding to the name of the communication destination by using the second database if the communication source belongs to the private IP address network and the communication destination belongs to the global IP address network.

Hence, claims 8 and 15 distinguish over Cook at least because of the above-noted features. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In view of the distinction of claims 8 and 15 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in Cook. Hence, Cook does not anticipate claims 8 and 15.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of U. S. Pub. No. 2003/0172145 issued to Nguyen (hereinafter referred to as Nguyen).

Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Nguyen and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 7,093,288 issued to Hydrie et al. (hereinafter referred to as Hydrie).

Claims 1, 8 and 15 have the above-noted features distinguished over Cook. The cited portions of other references, Nguyen and Hydrie do not disclose and teach or suggest the noted features of claims 1, 8 and 15.

Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted combination of references teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed Invention. In view of the distinction of claims 1, 8 and 15 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the asserted combination of references. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claims 1, 8 and 15.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2, 9 and 16 is moot.

Further, claims 3-7, 10-14 and 17-21 ultimately depend from claim 1, 8 or 15 respectively, and so at least similarly distinguish over the asserted combination of references.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 cannot be maintained. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Dated: January 19, 2010   By _____

Mehdi D. SHEIKERZ
Registration No.: 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202)434-1500
Facsimile: (202)434-1501